



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/819,456

03/28/2001

Samuel T. Christy

WDS-015

3435

21323

7590

01/19/2005

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,456

Applicant(s)

CHRISTY ET AL.

Examiner

Qi Han

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/28/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 03/28/2001 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 7, line 11, the content '“o” represents a subject marker' appears to be -- “o” represents an object marker--. Appropriate correction is required.

On page 20, line 21, the word “than” appears to be -- then--. Appropriate correction is required.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5-6, 10, 12-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2654

Regarding Claims 5 and 10, the limitation “the pivot **language is a language-independent constrained grammar**... and capable of translation among languages by direct substitution of words and phrases” is unclear, because (a) it doesn't make sense to say that a language **is** a grammar; (b) no where in the specification shows the pivot **language** has a **language-independent** constrain grammar; (d) the “capable of ...” is no positive term to determine whether the claimed invention really uses the following feature(s) or not; so that the limitation is indefinite.

Regarding Claims 6 and 12, the limitation “the pivot **language is** a constrained **grammar**...” is unclear, because it doesn't make sense to say that a language **is** a grammar, so that the limitation is indefinite.

Regarding Claim 13, the limitation “for matching between the item constrained **grammar** and the converted search **query**” is unclear, because the two terms are not in the same comparison category, so that the limitation is indefinite.

Regarding Claim 19, the limitation “wherein the transmission step” is unclear, because there are two transmission steps in the antecedent limitations of the claim, so that the limitation is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2654

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOSER et al. (US 6,275,789 B1), hereinafter referenced as MOSER.

As per **claim 1, 2 and 4**, they recite a method. The rejection is based on the same reason as described for apparatus claims 7, 8 and 11 respectively, because the claim recites same or similar limitation(s) as claims 7, 8 and 11 respectively (see below).

As per **claim 7**, MOSER discloses method and apparatus for performing full bi-directional translation between a source language and a linked alternative language (title), supplying access to all web pages on the internet (inherently including web site) (column 4, lines 46-48), comprising:

a. a plurality of browser-readable Web pages defining the site, at least some of the Web pages containing text portions represented in a pivot language, (column 41, lines 48-49, 'an Internet translator (necessary in a web site)' 'for on-line, rapid translation ... of web pages (Figs. 9A-C)'; column 42, line 62 to column 43, line 46, 'translating ... web pages from a source language such as English into an alternative language (interpreted as pivot language) for global use'); Fig. 9C, 'reformat the pages', 'display the LAL (linked alternative language that is equivalent to pivot language) document (including text portions) within the internet application');

b. a Web server for receiving a request from the visitor for a Web page and, in response thereto, locating the Web page and communicating it to the visitor, (column 43, lines 11-54, 'design the net software...to be load into the computer...to be used with state-of-art web servers (necessarily receiving a service request from user), browsers (inherently used by user/visitor for navigating/locating web pages)'; column 4, lines 57-59, 'providing Internet user

Art Unit: 2654

(the visitor) with a useful tool by which to communicate across linguistic barriers'; column 37, lines 55-60, 'communication texts might include...request...'); and

c. a translation module responsive to a visitor-specified natural language to for translating any text portions of the selected Web page from the pivot language into the desired natural language (column 45, line, 48 to column 46, line 13, 'translation device', 'a connection to the Internet'; column 42, lines 63-64, 'the Internet Translator, provide for the rapid translation of e-mail and web pages on the Internet'; column 48, lines 29-42, 'a means for translating between a source language and a target language (the desired natural language) by using a linked language mapped to the source language as a pivot language for translation').

MOSER does not expressly disclose that the translating the text(s) of the web page is prior to communication of the Web page. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MOSER himself, who teaches using Internet Translator Concordance to be loaded in the computer, in such way that it can be conveniently used with state-of-the-art web servers, browsers and related application (column 43, lines 38-45), wherein the internet translator provides for the rapid translation of web pages on the internet (column 42, lines 62-64), so that after the translation the browser/user can access the reformatted web page, as claimed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify MOSER for expressly providing translation of the text of the web page first and then communication of the Web page, as suggested by MOSER, for the purpose of conveniently using the translator mechanism with web servers and browsers (MOSER: column 43, lines 43-44).

As per **claim 8** (depending on claim 7), MOSER further discloses the visitor communicates with the Web site using a computer, the Web server interacting with a Web browser running as an active process on the visitor's computer, the desired natural language being entered in the Web browser, the Web server obtaining the desired natural language from the browser (column 37, lines 49-59, 'internet user (visitor)', 'communication texts might include inquiries, requests (interacting) for information (necessarily entered in the desired natural language', 'an example... Spanish as target (language)... for international communication'; column 43, lines 38-45, 'web page translation process' and 'Internet Translator Concordance to be loaded in the computer, in such way that it can be conveniently used with state-of-the-art web servers, browsers (using computer) and related application', wherein the web servers necessarily provide web site pages that are navigated/interacted by browsers for the internet translation).

As per **claim 11** (depending on claim 7), MOSER further discloses each Web page is represented in multiple versions (column 42, lines 62-66, 'internet translator, provides for the translation of ... web pages'; column 6, lines 14, 'Chinese users with access to Russian data by creating and employing a LAL linked to Russian (version), but expressed in a sub-set of Chinese characters (Chinese version)'), the text portions of each version being expressed in a constrained grammar corresponding to a different language (column 17, lines 9-13, 'means for translating between any of a plurality of languages by creating a linked alternative language'), the translation module being configured to (i) select the Web-page version corresponding to the desired natural language, (column 38, lines 10-12, 'allows the system to be set for the specific target language'), and (ii) translate the text portions into the desired natural language (column 38,

Art Unit: 2654

limes, 58-65, the translation is done by using 'databases' and 'templates' (text portions) 'for all supported target languages').

6. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOSER as applied to claims 1 and 7 in view of LAKRITZ (US 6,526,426 B1).

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for apparatus claim 9, because the claim recites same or similar limitation(s) as claim 9 (see below).

As per **claim 9** (depending on claim 7), even though MOSER discloses the visitor communicates with the Web site using a computer, the visitor's computer comprising a storage facility (inherently included in any computer) having the desired natural language (see rejection for claim 8 above), MOSER does not expressly disclose that the desired language indicated on a cookie stored and the Web server determining the desired natural language being through interrogation of the cookie. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by LAKRITZ, who discloses translation management system (title), comprising the visitor module 202 (Fig. 2) works in tandem (in network) with a customer's existing web server 203 and it automatically determining the language of a web site visitor and directs the web server to deliver the appropriate localized content to the visitor's browser 201 (column 3, lines 61-65), wherein the web site visitor's language may be determined from cookie (storing in visitor's computer) from previous visit to the web site (column 4, lines 28-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify MOSER for specifically providing storing cookie indicating the visitor's language for the web site (server), as

Art Unit: 2654

taught by LAKRITZ, for the purpose of determining the language to used for deliver the web content from the server to the browser (LAKRITZ: column 3, lines 64-66).

7. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOSER as applied to claims 1 and 7 in view of by CHRISTY (US 5,884,247).

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for apparatus claim 10, because the claim recites same or similar limitation(s) as claim 10 (see below).

As per **claim 10** (depending on claim 7), as best understand in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd (see above), MOSER further discloses the pivot language uses [is] a language independent constrained grammar convertible into natural languages and capable of translation among languages, (column 31, line 66 to column 32, line 20, 'a standard bilingual-dictionary entry on the usages of the word or phrases in the source language and in any a plurality of other natural languages', 'GRAMMAR: ...to restructure the grammar of a SL into a more regular and easier-to-master format (interpreted as constrained grammar) for the LAL might include'), each Web page being represented in a single version in which the text portions are expressed in the pivot language, (column 42, lines 63-64, 'the Internet Translator, provide for the rapid translation of e-mail and web pages on the Internet', 'translating ... web pages from source language ...into an alternative language (equivalent to pivot language) for global use'; Fig. 9C, 'reformat the pages', 'display the LAL document within the internet application'; which read on the limitation), the translation module being configured to (i) translate the text portions into a form representative of the desired language by direct substitution of words and phrases, and (ii)

Art Unit: 2654

convert the translated text portions into the desired natural language (column 17, lines 4-7, 'means for translating between any of a plurality of language by creating a linked alternative language (LAL) for each of said plurality of languages and then translating (step (i)) between those linked alternative languages', which includes capability to convert (step (ii)) a target LAL into the target language).

But, MOSER does not expressly disclose that the translation by using "direct substitution of words and phrases". However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHRISTY, who discloses method and apparatus for automated language translation (title), and the language translation permitting direct substitution of linguistic units (words or phrases) in one language for corresponding linguistic units in another language (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify MOSER for specifically providing direct substitution of linguistic units (words or phrases) for the translation, as taught by CHRISTY, for the purpose of offering a convenient and fast approach for translation among multiple languages (CHRISTY: column 12, lines 63-64).

8. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOSER as applied to claims 1 and 7 in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

As per **claim 6** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for apparatus claim 12, because the claim recites same or similar limitation(s) as claim 12 (see below).

As per **claim 12** (depending on claim 7), as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd (see above), MOSER further discloses the pivot language uses [is] a constrained

Art Unit: 2654

a grammar derived from one of a plurality of natural languages and convertible into constrained grammars derived from the other natural languages, (column 31, line 66 to column 32, line 20, a standard bilingual-dictionary entry on the usages of the word or phrases in the source language and in any a plurality of other natural languages or emulations thereof, 'GRAMMAR: ...to restructure the grammar of a SL into a more regular and easier-to-master format (interpreted as constrained grammar) for the LAL might include'; column 44, lines 6-22, 'load the web page or other document to be translated' and 'search for ... HTML code (suggesting can use HTML document and necessarily including attributes)'). But, MOSER does not expressly disclose the Web page being represented as an **XML** document including attributes relevant to the constrained grammar. However, an official notice is taken that the feature of using XML document for representing content of web page is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify MOSER for specifically providing web page content using XML document, for the purpose of offering extendable and compatible means with HTML document for representing a web content.

9. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CHRISTY in view of MOSER.

As per **claim 13**, as best understand in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd (see above), CHRISTY discloses method and apparatus for improved document searching (title), comprising:

a. facilitating entry of a natural-language search query by a user operating a client computer, the search query comprising a plurality of terms (abstract: 'search engine', 'search

Art Unit: 2654

query'; column 3, lines 10-17, 'to compose an abstract or query ... a natural-language sentence is translated or decomposed by using [into] the simpler grammar but preserving the original vocabulary', 'sentences are composed of "linguistic unit", each of which may be one or a few words (terms)'; column 12, lines 25-34, 'client machine, using a computer program called a "web browser")' ;

b. facilitating transmission, via a computer network, of the search query from the client computer to a language server (column 11, lines 35-46, 'much of the internet is based on the client-server (interpreted as language server) model of information exchange (transmission)');

c. facilitating conversion of the natural-language search query received by the language server into a constrained grammar through interaction, via the computer network, with the user, (column 3, lines 10-17, 'to compose an abstract or query ... a natural-language sentence is translated or decomposed (conversion) by using [into] the simpler grammar but preserving the original vocabulary'; column 13, lines 3-10, 'interaction with the user'; column 11, lines 30-35, 'the invention is suitably practiced in any system calling for electronic retrieval of document from a large database'); and

d. searching stored content items, at least a portion of each content item being expressed in the constrained grammar, for matches between the item constrained grammar and the converted search query (column 14, lines 29-36, 'search engine applies a client-originated query to database (storing content items) and generates a report listing the web pages matching the search criteria'; lines 51-54, 'the header of document each contain both keywords descriptive of the contents of the web page and an abstract, composed in accordance with the grammar hereinabove described').

But, CHRISTY does not expressly disclose the interaction including **disambiguation** of the query terms. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MOSER, who discloses human-assisted enhancement that opens the text for human-accessioned input and involves a computer guidance system (interaction with user) to supply alternatives for rare or ambiguous words (disambiguation) (column 34, lines 62-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify CHRISTY for specifically providing human-assisted input using a computer guidance, as taught by MOSER, for the purpose of further reduction of ambiguity (MOSER: column 34, lines 63-64).

As per **claim 14** (depending on claim 13), CHRISTY further discloses ranking at least some of the items containing matches in an order of relevance, the order favoring items having constrained-grammar terms that literally match the converted search query (column 14, lines 34, 'the list is ranked... to reflect both the absolute number of word or information unit matches between the query and the listed documents as well as other factors suggesting relevance', 'a document in which word order is preserved or the query terms are found in close proximity to one another may be ranked higher than another document with the same number of word matches but where the words are separated or scattered; and column 15, lines 7-17).

As per **claim 15** (depending on claim 13), CHRISTY in view of MOSER further discloses the client computer interacts with the language server through communication, via the computer network, with a host server, the host server communicating via the computer network with the language server to facilitate the interaction (CHRISTY: column 11, lines 35-52, 'much of the internet is based on the client-server model of information exchange', 'the client computers ... can use (communicate) the server to reach other servers', MOSER: column 43, lines 10-22,

Art Unit: 2654

'allow ...Internet Translator Concordance to be load into computer, in such way that it can be used with state-of-the-art web servers, browsers'; this suggests that the system has the capability of communicating among or through multiple servers, which can be read on the claimed limitations).

As per **claim 16** (depending on claim 15), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 15, because the rejection for claim 16 covers limitation(s) of claim 15.

As per **claim 17** (depending on claim 15), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 15, because the rejection for claim 16 covers limitation(s) as claim 15.

10. Claims 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CHRISTY in view of MOSER, an further in view of Christy (US 5,884,247) hereinafter referenced as CHRISTY2.

As per **claim 18**, it recites a method of facilitating information composition and broadcast. Regarding the claimed elements a., b, c. and e., the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 13 and 7, because the claimed elements a., b, c. and e. recite same or similar limitation(s) as elements in claims 13-a 13b, 13-c and 7-c. In addition, CHRISTY in view of MOSER further discloses that the system can be used for authoring texts and persons drafting abstracts of scientific articles for international audiences, for those preparing web pages advertising products globally, for those writing e-mail, and for others wishing to transmit basic information on the Internet; and used in conjunction with the Internet Translator (corresponding to language server) (MOSER: column 14, lines 4-9) and 'communication texts might include...request...' (CHRISTY: column 37, lines 55-60), which is read on the claimed

Art Unit: 2654

“facilitating information composition” and necessarily includes “d. facilitating designation of the desired natural language by a receiving device” and “f. causing transmission of the text composition in the desired natural language to the receiving device via a communication medium”.

But, CHRISTY in view of MOSER does not expressly disclose “facilitating information broadcast”. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHRISTY2, who discloses method and apparatus for improve document searching (title), and teaches that the same thoughts may be simultaneously broadcast to multiple interlocutors (equitant to facilitating information broadcast) each speaking a different language, with their individual responses simultaneously and multiply translated as well (column 2, lines 46-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify CHRISTY in view of MOSER for specifically providing broadcasting some information (facilitating information broadcast), as taught by CHRISTY2, for the purpose of sending the same thoughts (information) to multiple interlocutors (CHRISTY2: column 2, lines 46-47).

As per **claim 19** (depending on claim 18), as best understand in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd (see above), CHRISTY in view of MOSER and CHRISTY2 further discloses that the (second) transmission step is accomplished by a broadcast server in communication, via a computer network (internet), with the language server, the receiving device communicating with the broadcast server to specify the desired natural language, (CHRITY2: column 2, lines 46-47, wherein the means for broadcasting thoughts is interpreted as broadcast server; MOSER: column 42, line 63 to column 43, line 24, 'the Internet Translator' is interpreted as language server, 'browser' (corresponding to receiving device); column 6, lines 13-

Art Unit: 2654

14, 'provides Chinese user with access to Russian data...but expressed (specified) in a sub-set of Chinese character).

As per **claim 20** (depending on claim 19), as stated above (see claim 18), CHRISTY in view of MOSER and CHRISTY2 discloses that the broadcast server receives from the language server a plurality of natural-language versions of the text composition including a version in the desired natural language, the broadcast server transmitting said version to the receiving device, (CHRITY2: column 2, lines 46-47; MOSER: column 14, lines 4-9).

As per **claim 21** (depending on claim 19), CHRISTY in view of MOSER and CHRISTY2 further discloses that the broadcast server identifies the desired natural language to the language server, which, in response, translates the converted text composition from the pivot language into the desired natural language and transmits translated text composition via a computer network to the broadcast server for transmission to the receiving device, (CHRITY2: column 2, lines 62-66, 'a news reporter might file a story worded [in] using the invention's grammar (corresponding to in pivot language) for dissemination to numerous bureaus serving different national audiences. The story is instantly translated into the appropriate languages (including the desired natural language) upon arrival at the different bureaus, where it may then be further refined into a form suitable for communication (transmission) to the audience').

As per **claim 22**, it recites a method of facilitating electronic exchange. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 18, because the claim recites same or similar limitation(s) as claims 18. It is noted that, in addition, the limitation "electronic message" or "message" herein can be broadly interpreted as e-mail, computer file, search query and its response, web content, and other internet interactive information, which are disclosed by all

Art Unit: 2654

references (CHRISTY: column 2, lines 35; MOSER: column 4, lines 48-49, 'web pages' and 'electric mail'; CHRISTY2, column 2, lines 50 and 62, 'exchange messages by e-mail', 'file (in computer)').

As per **claim 23** (depending on claim 22), CHRISTY in view of MOSER and CHRISTY2 further discloses that “the recipient operates a client computer, the message being initially transmitted to the recipient's client computer in the pivot language, the recipient's client computer transmitting, via a computer network, the pivot-language message and the language designation to the language server, the language server translating the message into the desired natural language and transmitting the natural-language message via the computer network to the recipient's client computer”, (CHRISTY2: column 2, lines 41-57, ‘native German speaker (recipient) ... exchanging thoughts (including receiving and transmitting) via the computer’, ‘exchange message by email (necessarily including computer network),... ‘formulating the message in accordance with the invention's grammar (interpreted as the message in pivot language, also see specification, page 4, line 21)’; MOSER: column 6, lines 8-15, ‘provide Chinese user with access to Russian data by creating and employing a LAL linked to Russian, but expressed in a sub-set of Chinese users with character (necessarily sending language designation’), column 42, line 62 to column 43, line 15, ‘the Internet translator (language server), provides for the rapid translation of e-mail... on the Internet (computer network)’, ‘web servers (comprising an Internet Translator), browsers (in client computers)').

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 22), CHRISTY in view of MOSER and CHRISTY2 further discloses that “the recipient operates a client computer, the message being initially transmitted to the recipient's client computer in the pivot language, the recipient's client

Art Unit: 2654

computer transmitting, via a computer network, the pivot-language message and the language designation to a second language server, the second language server translating the message into the desired natural language and transmitting the natural-language message via the computer network to the recipient's client computer, (CHRISTY2: column 2, lines 41-57, 'native German speaker (recipient) ... exchanging thoughts (including receiving and transmitting) via the computer', 'exchange message by email (necessarily including computer network),... 'formulating the message in accordance with the invention's grammar (interpreted as the message in pivot language, also see specification, page 4, line 21)'; MOSER: column 6, lines 8-15, 'provide Chinese user with access to Russian data by creating and employing a LAL linked to Russian, but expressed in a sub-set of Chinese users with character (necessarily sending language designation'), column 42, line 62 to column 43, line 15, 'the Internet translator (language server), provides for the rapid translation of e-mail... on the Internet (computer network)', 'web servers (comprising an Internet Translator), browsers (in client computers)'; CHRISTY: column 11, lines 35-52, 'the client computers ... can use (communicate) the server to reach other servers'; which suggests the system has the capability for using and communicating among or through multiple servers for the translation, as claimed).

Conclusion

11. 4Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2654

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9306, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria , VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (703) 305-5631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-6954.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
January 10, 2005

Donald L. Stone
PATENT EXAMINER
AU 2654